



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,002	11/24/2003	Jean-Emile Elien	MSFT-2752/302033	5648
41505 7590 01/23/2008 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER CAO, PHUONG THAO	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/23/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/721,002	ELIEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/27/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Zou and Upton do not teach or suggest the claimed invention (claims 1, 13 and 21), Examiner disagrees.

It is a well settled rule that a reference must be considered not only for what it expressly teaches but also for what it fairly suggests. See In re Burckel, 592 F.2d 1175, 201 USPQ 67 (CCPA 1979) and In re Lamberti, 545 F.2d 747, 192 USPQ 278 (CCPA 1976) as well as In re Bode, 550 F.2d 656, 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977) which indicates such fair suggestions to unpreferred embodiments must be considered even if they were not illustrated. Additionally, it is an equally well settled rule that what a reference can be said to fairly suggest relates to the concepts fairly contained therein, and is not limited by the specific structure chosen to illustrate such concepts. See In re Bascom, 230 F.2d 612, 109 USPQ 98 (CCPA 1956).

Zou teaches in page 4, column 2, under Legacy Service that an object wrapper (e.g., CORBA object wrapper acts as an interface adapter) serves as an adapter to allow remote clients access legacy services or components. Any software program can be broadly interpreted as an application. As such, the legacy services or components as disclosed are interpreted as applications and object wrappers acting as interface adapters of the services or components are interpreted as adapters. Zou also teaches in page 7, column 2 a user interface which allows for the user to specify the service description by filling the forms in an HTML Web Interface, then information entered by the user is used to generate a XML service description and stored along with a service ID (see page 7, under Service Repository). Since Zou further discloses that each type of back-end services can be registered by its own specific interface description (see Zou, page 5, column 2, paragraph 3) and the XML encoded service interface description (see page 7) is used to generate the service wrapper (i.e., set up adapter)(see page 9, first whole paragraph), the user interface for registering service description (see Figure 8) can be interpreted as a user interface for setting up its adapter (e.g., wrapper). Also see Zou, page 11, column 1, paragraph 2 for the disclosure of the new functionality of the legacy object (application) can be added to the wrapper class (adapter) as long as the method name is registered in the interface, which fairly suggests that an adapter (i.e., wrapper) is configured based on registered information and the user interface for registering interface description of services or components can be interpreted as the user interface for configuring their adapters (i.e., wrappers). Thus, the user interface for service registration (see Zou, page 7, under Service Registration) is interpreted as the user interface for configuring and setting up adapters (wrappers of services) and the Service Description Interface (Fig. 8) is broadly interpreted as configuration schema of adapters.

Regarding Applicant's argument with respect to Upton reference, this argument is moot in view of the disclosure of user interface for configuring and setting adapters by Zou.


CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER